UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK						
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA						
	JUDGMENT INCLUDING SENTENCE					
-v-	UNDER THE SENTENCING REFORM ACT					
PRIESTLY GREEN	CASE NUMBER: CR-03-1368 (ARR)					
	16 COURT STREET					
	BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11241					
	Defendant's Attorney & Address					
THE DEFENDANT:	Defendant's Accorney & Address					
	s one & two of the superseding indictment after a plea of					
not guilty.	some a two or the supersearing indicament arter a prea or					
	nt is ADJUDGED guilty of such count(s), which involve the					
following offenses:	Is impossed gariey of sach count(s), which involve the					
TITLE & SECTION NA	ATURE & OFFENSE COUNT NUMBER(S)					
21 USC 963, 960 (a) (1) & CC						
	ITH INTENT TO DISTRIBUTE 5 KILOGRAMS OR MORE OF COCAINE.					
21 USC 846 & 841 (b) (1) (A) CO						
	ITH INTENT TO DISTRIBUTE 5 KILOGRAMS OR MORE OF COCAINE.					
	THE PROPERTY OF A COUNTRY OF COUNTRY.					
The defendant is sentenced as provided in pages 2 through of this Judgment.  The sentence is imposed pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984.						
The defendant has been found not guilty on count(s) and is discharged as to such count(s).						
• •	missed on the motion of the United States.					
	e defendant shall pay to the United States a special					
assessment of \$200.00 which shall be due XXX immediately as follows:						
It is further ORDERED that the defendant shall notify the United States Attorney for this district within 30 days of any change of residence or mailing address until all fines,						
restitution, costs, and special assessments imposed by this Judgment are fully paid.						
Defendant's Soc. Sec	MAY 16, 2006					
	Date of Imposition of Sentence					
Defendant's Date of Birth 7/1/	<u>′67                                    </u>					
	ARR /					
Defendant's Mailing Address:	ALLYNE R. ROSS, U.S.D.J.					
4851 NW 18 <sup>th</sup> COURT	MAY 16, 2006					
	Date					
LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA 33313						
	A TRUE COPY ATTEST					
Defendant's Residence Address:	Date:					

( SAME AS ABOVE )

CLERK OF COURT

Defendant: PRIESTLY GREEN
Case Number: CR-03-1368 (ARR)

Judgment - Page

of

## IMPRISONMENT

The defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of forty eight (48) months. Counts one and two of the superseding indictment are to run concurrently.

XXX	The Court makes the following recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons: THAT THE DEFT BE HOUSED IN A FACILITY AS CLOSE AS POSSIBLE TO THE MIAMI, FLORID
AREA.	
	The defendant is remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal.  The defendant shall surrender to the United States Marshal for this district,
	ata.m./p.m. on
	as notified by the Marshal.
	The defendant shall surrender for service of sentence at the institution designated by the Bureau of Prisons
	before 12:00 noon on
	as notified by the United States Marshal.
	as notified by the Probation Office.
	RETURN
	I have executed this Judgment as follows:
Defen	dant delivered on to at
	, with a certified copy of this Judgment.
	United States Marshal
	D

Defendant: PRIESTLY GREEN
Case Number: CR-03-1368 (ARR)

Judgment - Page

of

## SUPERVISED RELEASE

Upon release from imprisonment, the defendant shall be on supervised release for a term of five (5) years.

While on supervised release, the defendant shall not commit another Federal, state, or local crime and shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this court (set forth on the following page). If this judgment imposes a restitution obligation, it shall be a condition of supervised release that the defendant pay any such restitution that remains unpaid at the commencement of the term of supervised release. The defendant shall comply with the following additional conditions:

- 1) IF EXCLUDED; DEFT SHALL NOT RE-ENTER THE UNITED STATES ILLEGALY.
- 2) DEFT SHALL NOT POSSESS ANY FIREARMS.

 The defendant	shall pay	any fines	that remain	unpaid at	the commencement
of the term of	f supervise	d release.			

Defendant: PRIESTLY GREEN

Case Number: CR-03-1368 (ARR)

Judgment - Page of

## STANDARD CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISION

While the defendant is on probation or supervised release pursuant to this Judgment:

- 1) The defendant shall not commit another Federal, state or local crime;
- 2) the defendant shall not leave the judicial district without the permission of the court or probation officer;
- 3) the defendant shall report to the probation officer as directed by the court or probation officer and shall submit a truthful and complete written report within the first five days of each month;
- 4) the defendant shall answer truthfully all inquiries by the probation officer and follow the instructions of the probation officer;
- 5) the defendant shall support his or her dependents and meet other family responsibilities;
- 6) the defendant shall work regularly at a lawful occupation unless excused by the probation officer for schooling, training, or other acceptable reasons;
- 7) the defendant shall notify the probation officer within seventy-two hours of any change in residence or employment;
- 8) the defendant shall refrain from excessive use of alcohol and shall not purchase, possess, use, distribute, or administer any narcotic or other controlled substance, or any paraphernalia related to such substances, except as prescribed by a physician;
- 9) the defendant shall not frequent places where controlled substances are illegally sold, used, distributed, or administered;
- 10) the defendant shall not associate with any persons engaged in criminal activity, and shall not associate with any person convicted of a felony unless granted permission to do so by the probation officer;
- the defendant shall permit a probation officer to visit him or her at any time at home or elsewhere and shall permit confiscation of any contraband observed in plain view by the probation officer;
- 12) the defendant shall notify the probation officer within seventy-two hours of being arrested or questioned by a law enforcement officer;
- 13) the defendant shall not enter into any agreement to act as an informer or a special agent of a law enforcement agency without the permission of the court;
- 14) as directed by the probation officer, the defendant shall notify third parties of risks that may be occasioned by the defendant's criminal record or personal history or characteristics, and shall permit the probation officer to make such notifications and to confirm the defendant's compliance with such notification requirement.

These conditions are in addition to any other conditions imposed by this Judgment.

Defendant: PRIESTLY GREEN Judgment - Page Case Number: CR-03-1368 (ARR) FINE WITH SPECIAL ASSESSMENT The defendant shall pay to the United States the sum of \$ 200.00 \_\_\_\_, consisting of a fine of \$ N/A and a special assessment of \$ 200.00 These amounts are the totals of the fines and assessments imposed on individual counts, as follows: This sum shall be paid \_\_\_ immediately \_\_\_ as follows:

XXX The Court has determined that the defendant does not have the ability to

\_\_\_\_ The interest requirement is waived.
\_\_\_ The interest requirement is modified as follows:

pay any fines, cost of confinement or supervision.

of

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT									
2		EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK								
3										
4	4									
5	5 Brooklyn, New	U.S. Courthouse Brooklyn, New York								
6										
7										
8		a.m.								
9	TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING  BEFORE THE HONORABLE ALLYNE R. ROSS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE									
10										
11	11 APPEARANCES:									
12	12	ROSLYNN R. MAUSKOPF United States Attorney 147 Pierrepont Street Brooklyn, New York 11201 BY: MICHAEL RAMOS Assistant(s) U.S. Attorney								
13	13 United States Attorney									
14	14 Brooklyn, New York 1120									
15										
16	For the Defendant: BERNARD UDELL, ESQ.	BERNARD UDELL, ESQ.								
17										
18	18									
19	Court Reporter: SHELDON SILVERMAN									
20	20 Official Court Reporter	Official Court Reporter 225 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York 11201								
21										
22	(110) 200-2331									
23	23									
24		rancarint								
25	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography. Transcript Produced By Computer Aided Transcription.									

from high school and college I worked so hard to see my daughter go to medical school. Within a year my kids come to Florida to live with me, honor role in Fort Lauderdale. I'm finished, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Let me say I understood most of what Mr. Green told me. There are some things I'm not sure I did understand. I am continuing to assume there was a valid safety valve proffer with the government?

MR. RAMOS: Yes. The problem with Mr. Green I guess is the continued lack of understanding an empty conspiracy is still a conspiracy. Nevertheless we had that problem with the safety valve. We established the essential facts of the phone calls, what they meant.

THE COURT: Having determined that the evidence did not support the jury's conclusion the defendant Priestly Green was involved in a marijuana importation conspiracy, defendant must be sentenced based solely upon his conviction of the importation and distribution conspiracies involving five kilograms or more of cocaine.

Because as discussed below, defendant has been given the safety valve and I have concluded a mitigating role adjustment is warranted, base offense level is 30.

Defendant's conduct in connection with the charged offenses has two separate aspects. Initially, defendant, as I understand it, was the first person to introduce Weatherly

into the Universal cocaine conspiracy and, second, the defendant played a role in the so-called ITI scheme to import cocaine from Venezuela and/or Panama.

Defendant's role in the Universal scheme was, as the government acknowledges, fleeting. Weatherly testified that in 2002 his friend, Sean Scott, introduced him to the defendant. The defendant told -- I'm sorry, Weatherly told the defendant of a drug connection from Guyana on Universal Airlines and the need for someone to remove bags from the aircraft. When the defendant agreed to assist, Weatherly told him to expect a telephone call. In fact, three days later Adams met with Weatherly -- I'm sorry, let me do that again.

Defendant's role in the Universal scheme was, as the government acknowledges, fleeting. Weatherly testified in 2002 his friend Sean Scott introduced him to the defendant. The defendant told Weatherly of the drug connection from Guyana on Universal Airlines and the need for someone to remove bags from the aircraft. When Weatherly agreed to assist, Green told him to expect a call. In fact, three days later, Adams met with Weatherly and after a more detailed discussion recruited Weatherly into the scheme.

From that time, the Universal Airlines cocaine importation conspiracy persisted for approximately one and a half years successfully importing massive quantities of cocaine on numerous occasions. The players were also

numerous, but as the evidence demonstrated, Priestly Green did nothing at all beyond the initial inquiry of Weatherly to further the scheme. Rather, Adams under Brown's direction consistently managed Weatherly.

From this evidence I infer the defendant in his one conversation with Weatherly was not functioning as a typical recruiter who proceeds to manage or supervise his recruits, and who maintains interest in his recruits' successful performance of duties entrusted on behalf of a criminal organization. Rather, the evidence compels the conclusion that the defendant's sole role in the Universal scheme was to introduce Weatherly to Adams at Adams request.

The evidence strongly suggests because Adams had no contacts at Evergreen Eagle, the company that serviced Universal flights and employed Weatherly, Adams asked Green who apparently knew Weatherly's friend Sean Scott to make an introduction for him. Once the introduction was made, defendant dropped out of the picture completely and the conspiracy proceeded without defendant having ever again in any way acting to further its goals.

In this context, defendant's mere making of an introduction in 2002 plainly bespeaks a role in the conspiracy that is at most minimal. The defendant's role in the ITI scheme to import cocaine from Venezuela and/or Panama was greater than his role in the Universal scheme, but at best it

was a minor one and in my view falls more comfortably between a minor and minimal role.

Cooperating coconspirator Selwyn Smith had been in contact with two suppliers, Red and Estrella, the latter of whom Adams referred to as cancellation about sending cocaine to JFK via Miami. Estrella asked Smith whether Adams had any contacts in Miami. Adams identified the defendant as someone who could remove a bag in Miami and forward it to New York without clearance through Customs in Miami.

In a series of tape recorded telephone conversations between Adams and defendant, defendant makes clear that he is willing and able to intercept drugs in Miami and reroute them to New York. Again, following his arrest, defendant acknowledged to law enforcement that he had such discussions with Adams regarding rerouting drugs from Miami.

The record, however, provides no evidence of any successful ITI shipment, nor is there evidence of any actual shipment in which defendant took part. In short, the evidence shows defendant made himself available to Adams to reroute luggage in Miami, thereby bypassing Customs but ultimately never engaged in any such conduct.

Notably, too, there was no evidence in the record as to what benefit defendant was to receive for his proffered services in this aspect of the ITI scheme and there was certainly no suggestion Green had a proprietary interest in

any cocaine. Overall, considering defendant's role in introducing Adams to Weatherly in the Universal scheme in conjunction with his role in the ITI scheme; that is, making himself available to Adams, the reasonable inference from the evidence is that defendant's role in the combined conspiracies was no greater than between minor and minimal.

This inference is confirmed by the record evidence of the context of the massive cocaine importation scheme at JFK and the number of participants whose roles far exceeded that of defendant, evidence I view as reasonably illustrative of such schemes nationwide.

Accordingly, I find defendant is entitled to a three level role reduction. Given an adjusted offense level of 25, a criminal history category of one, the advisory guidelines call for a prison term of 57 to 71 months. In assessing an appropriate sentence for defendant, I have considered the advisory guidelines. I note, however, that even if defendant were not entitled to so great a role reduction under the guidelines, that would not for reasons expressed in that opinion affect my view of an appropriate sentence under Section 3553(a).

In considering the nature and circumstances of the offense, I have in the case of Mr. Green considered as an exacerbating factor the fact that he made use of his job position at JFK and Miami airports in committing crimes of

which he was convicted. Although I have found the government failed to present evidence sufficient to find by a preponderance that law enforcement authorities in fact reposed trust in airport employees, a finding essential to the imposition of the abuse of trust enhancement under the guidelines, there is ample evidence in the record to establish the defendant took advantage of his job in committing these offenses, a job that though not established to be a repository of trust by law enforcement, is nonetheless a highly sensitive one due to the enhanced societal dangers posed by corruption at a major international airport or such as JFK and Miami airports.

These crimes were serious ones. They're exacerbated by the fact in committing them they took advantage of a sensitive position at major airports but mitigated somewhat by his role and the fact his offenses involved no weapons or violence of any kind.

Turning to the history and characteristics of the defendant, Mr. Green is a 38-year old permanent resident from Jamaica. Following his firing by American Airlines for his participation in the instant offenses and prior to his remand in May, 2005, defendant succeeded in securing other employment working at two courier companies in Florida. The father of two children, ages 17 and 9, the defendant separated from his wife a year ago. However, he took responsibility for the

children and brought them to Florida to live with him and his fiance.

Although defendant's fiance is employed as a ticket agent in Miami, no argument has been proffered that the children cannot be supported without defendant's assistance. It's clear from the letters the children and family members that his children look to the defendant for emotional support.

Defendant has no prior convictions or arrests and has never before had any brush with the law. Given all of the factors pertaining to the defendant and his offenses, I believe a sentence of 48 months imprisonment, which is moderately below his advisory guideline, is sufficient but not unduly severe to accomplish the goals of sentencing enumerated in Section 3553(a).

The crimes, although inchoate, are serious and a prison term of four years is a severe one, thus serving the goal of just punishment.

I'm also taking into consideration the fact the defendant, although he obviously did not qualify for 5K letter, was of assistance to the government at the time of his arrest. Additionally, the defendant ultimately chose to proffer to the government and the government has found his admissions regarding his conduct candid.

Obviously, again, although this does not qualify him for any form of reduction for acceptance of responsibility, it

does be peak a form of acceptance of responsibility in that, prior to sentence. He acknowledged what he did, which demonstrates to some extent remorse and contrition suggesting a reduced risk of recidivism. Indeed, all the facts and circumstances of this case point to a very low risk of recidivism, suggesting the selected sentence amply serves the statutory goal of specific deterrence and the companion goal of protecting the public against future acts of the defendant.

This is especially so in light of the fact the defendant will undoubtedly be deported after his release from jail.

In my view the selected sentence, which is a lengthy and severe one, also serves the goal of general deterrence. In this regard, I believe it is of sufficient severity to serve as deterrent to other airport employees who might otherwise succumb to the temptation to corrupt their sensitive positions for pecuniary or other personal gain.

Accordingly, I sentence Mr. Green to the custody of the Attorney General for a period of 48 months to run concurrently on the two counts to be followed by a five-year period of supervised release with special conditions that if deported he not illegally reenter the United States, and I prohibit the possession of a firearm. I make a finding that he is unable to pay a fine, but I will impose the mandatory \$200 special assessment.

Mr. Green, I'm sure you know and understand that you are entitled to appeal both your conviction and your sentence. If you choose to appeal, a notice of appeal must be filed within ten days. Undoubtedly Mr. Udell will continue to represent you on appeal.

MR. UDELL: Will the court recommend that he serve the sentence in a facility in the Miami, Florida area?

THE COURT: Yes.

(Whereupon this matter was concluded for this date.)